DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL RECEIVED AUG - 2 1993

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS COMMUN OFFICE OF THE SECRETAR

				PETANY	.,
Implementation of Sections of the Cable Television Consumer)				
Protection and Competition Act of 1992))	MM Docket	No.	92-266	
	j			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Rate Regulation)				

CONTINENTAL CABLEVISION, INC.'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Continental Cablevision, Inc. ("Continental") hereby replies to limited matters raised in oppositions to petitions for reconsideration in this docket.

Opposition) Continental's counsel explained that the franchising authorities have no risk in delaying certification of regulation over Continental's basic rates, and suggested the potential benefits of putting off certification. The Michigan Communities accuse Continental of "seriously misleading" franchising authorities with the ulterior motive of evading rate regulation. Michigan Communities at 1-9. Unfortunately, these intemperate accusations come as no surprise. Counsel for the Michigan Communities raised the same general concerns in a letter dated June 29, 1993 addressed to the city attorney of Lansing, Michigan. Attachment A. Continental's counsel responded to the accusations point-by-point, demonstrating that Continental's representations to Michigan franchising authorities were and remain entirely accurate. Attachment B. We invite the Commission to consider this attached response as our rebuttal to the Michigan Communities' unfounded assertions.

This episode demonstrates the mischief caused by municipal attorneys and consultants who do not understand the fundamental framework of the Commission's rate regulations. The Michigan Communities' counsel would use Continental's efforts to maintain cordial relations with its franchising authorities as a springboard to create an adversarial atmosphere. Senseless adversarial posturing threatens to replace cooperative and mutually beneficial working relationships between cable operators and their local franchising authorities. Continental places great

value on its reputation and on harmonious co-existence with local regulators, as Lansing, Michigan officials would readily verify.

for cable rate regulation). The Commission should reject these equally unrealistic suggestions.

Continental respectfully asks that the Commission reconsider and clarify its rate regulation rules as more fully set forth in Continental's Petition and Opposition.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J / Sachs

CONTINENTAL CABLEVISION, INC.

The Pilot House

Lewis Wharf

Boston, Massachusetts 02110

(617) 742-9500

Paul Glist

Robert G. Scott, Jr.

COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN

1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Suite 200

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-9750

August 2, 1993

ATTACHMENT A

₹517 484 ~082

VARNUM, KIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT ATTORNEYS AT LAW

BRILLY STATES PLACE POST OFFICE DOX 162 - GRAND RAPINS, MICHIGAN 49501-0552 TELECTIONE 616/3164000 - FAX 616/314-7000

MARKING DAMES IN WILLIAME VANTING MLARY F. SWELL PATRICIAL AND STREET KONEKT LEEVELD RENTI-VANA CAPLE VER MEK KH EINGTT PANEL PAREN GART RECORDER THOMASTHUM TOGOTHYLCZBUNK H. ROWAND PALE XERI E MONEY force Monthly

TITCHAST, LITTLE TIOMASI NADE MOREST IN COLLECTION KETIARDA. KAY MANY , THEEY MILES EASTER RESERVA WITHIN JAINTI BACK THIN'T TOWN THE MARKET PROCESS PARKY. PERUS PORTOT P, CENTER PRANTICULARITA NTALIUDGEAS MCHARD 4. NEXIONA KANDALL W. DRANGE PETER A SULT MARKE HANDES! DOGIANT WEEKEYIK MAREIN A LANSTR

THOMAS LOCKHART BUSIL TAHON MILES ILDION BOLICE COCCOLAN CHANN I WORK Buch Schlengwork THOMASA HERMAN PHILE FOR STREET LAMBRER, MIRE ANTINES DESCRIPTION EXINDATEICS WHERE CIMILER M. DESTON HANDENGE METH THEMASCELLITER

HARLY CLITTAL WILLIAM LLAWRENCE IN CHECKT IL FALLER ENTERNING WINGSANDE FORFITA HENDERS HONARO WELDWILL THOSHY J. TORNCA PROCESS ESTABLES MRKS ALLARS TO STORY IS EASILY DONALD PLANTES KNALE KE KE CHORDER DAVIS

MOOTE BET-KENT X FINDERS PARTIE I WATER JOHN ELEMICOLOY PRICE. KAN GREEN MENTAREMEN MENARELMENA LEZIAN REKLY KATHERDY E ROCKTHAM JERREY L FRASER KENADESHORE MITACHED! CONTROL DANGED MANAGED TANGED MAINSON TOTTE SALES OF THE SECOND

VKXIS-YCEARS MATAN K. ANDREWSON MARK WENAR ANCHER'C FATHER AND LANK TATHERA MILES STEVEN L'MORGEN
ENVOIANGALIANI ETHORANIET THEMS! AND THEM HOSIAN KLISTALIO THEMAS CLICITIES CONSTRUCTORY ENDALL CHOOLINE Malajtili Kana Chiterap. ALL PHAPES MUCELL YARRESTAN

HARCDANEHAK WILLIAM L HALLIDAY, JR. ELEMENT AL KEHA THERMOTE MACEN TAKEN BATTE MERBALIA IL RATHERM ANDERESS TAKEN BATTE MERBALIA HERITA DAKE MARKE YIYEMTI KINL WESTERNOON L-MILLIAM HATTON **CANDALTANDALS** HOMEON & ROCKES

MANAGER BY

June 29, 1993

RECEIVED

-IUL 2 1993

LAW DEPARTMENT

City of Lansing 5th Floor City Hall Lausing, MI 48933

Mr. Alvan P. Knot

City Attorney

Dear Al:

Thanks for fexing the correspondence from Continental Cablevision to the City about rate regulation with respect to the letter from Continental's attorneys dated June 8. The key is that Continental's rates are currently \$300,000 to \$350,000 per year below the FCC approved benchmark in the City of Lansing alone. Unless by November 14 the City has taken all four steps necessary to regulate rates, Continental will be able to raise its rates by \$350,000 per year and the City will not be able to undo the increase.

If adjacent townships served by Continental do meet the deadline, then the rates in the townships will be significantly lower than in the City.

The statements in the second paragraph in the June 8 letter to Mr. Weigand are simply inapplicable to the situation described above as they pertain to cities where Continental's rates are above the FCC benchmark. Continental does not point out that the cable companies are challenging the "one year reach back" provision it describes. And it does not point out that there is no one year reach back for the "middle tier" of rates which are regulated directly by the FCC.

The statement in the third paragraph is legally incorrect: We do not believe that an agreement entered into by a cable company outside the rate regulation process is binding on the cable company. Certainly the City would not wish to take any risk in this regard.

As to the fourth paragraph, for practical purposes the City can easily settle rates: If City

07/07/93 09:58 07/06/83

15:19

21 517 485 0344 **2517 484 782**

CONTINENTAL CABL LATTERMAN ASSOC

Ø 003 **2**004/004

VARNUM, KIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Mr. Alvan P. Knot June 29, 1993 Page Z

In several cities, we have seen Continental make a big push to try to get cities to delay or

ATTACHMENT B

COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SECOND FLOOR

1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006-3458

(202) 659-9750

ALAN RAYWID (1930-1991)

CABLE ADDRESS "CRAB"

TELECOPIER (202) 452-0067

July 8, 1993

Direct Dial (202) 828-9820

JOHN P COLE, JR.

ROBERT L. JAMES JOSEPH R. REIFER

BURT A. BRAVERMAN

FRANCES J. CHETWYND

* ADMITTED IN PENNSYLVANIA ONLY **ADMITTED IN VIRGINIA ONLY

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Richard Weigand Continental Cablevision 1111 Michigan Avenue, Suite 200 East Lansing, MI 48823

Dear Richard:

You have asked me to respond to Mr. Pestle's letter of June 29, 1993, which takes issue with my letter of June 8. Mr. Pestle's letter proceeds from the premise that Continental will be able to raise rates by \$350,000 unless the City certifies to the FCC. He is mistaken for several reasons.

In the first place, he does not appear to understand how the FCC benchmark system and the Forms 393 actually operate. One cannot determine whether or not a system's program service rates are above or below the benchmark merely by multiplying the number of channels times the number from the FCC's benchmark table and comparing the rates for programming service with the rates now charged. The "benchmark" numbers include equipment and installation revenues. The FCC rules and forms therefore require that all revenue from installation, reconnection, additional outlets, remote controls, converters, and other customer equipment be added into program service revenues and spread across channels before the comparison is made. In as much as approximately 9.9% of Continental's present revenues are from such installation and equipment revenues, the rates in Lansing are not below the benchmark. Instead, various rates will need to be restructured and reduced to meet the FCC rate benchmark standards.

Continental has every intention of bringing its rates into alignment with FCC regulation by the effective date of the rate rules. But suppose Mr. Pestle fears otherwise. The City

JOHN D. SEIVER WESLEY R. HEPPLER PAUL GLIST DAVID M. SILVERMAN JAMES F. IRELAND TI STEVEN J. HORVITZ ROBERT G. SCOTT, JR. SUSAN WHELAN WESTFALL GARY I. RESNICK JANET R. THOMPSON* THERESA A. ZETERBERG STEPHEN L. KABLER JOHN DAVIDSON THOMAS TIMOTHY R. FURR MARIA T. BROWNE®® BENJAMIN E. GOLANT

COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN

Richard Weigand July 8, 1993 Page -2-

need not certify in order to assure Continental's compliance. the first place, the FCC's rate freeze capped all regulated revenues at April 1993 levels until November 15. Any rate increase after that would be preceded by at least 30 days notice under FCC rules, during which time a City could (if it felt compelled), certify to the FCC. Even if it chose not to certify, the City could still control basic rates. As to basic rates, the City could at any time during the first year certify and reach back to the effective date of regulation (October 1), undoing any increase made by Continental. Mechanically, the reach back operates because basic rates would have to be reduced to September 30, 1992 per channel rates, less 10%, or to the FCC benchmark. Subsequent increases are of no effect. Mr. Pestle is correct that after I wrote my letter, some cable commentators took issue with the "reach back" rule. Continental did not, and I did not, and I resent the implication made by Mr. Pestle that I was hiding something.

As to tier rates, Mr. Pestle is correct that there is no one-year "reach back," but that is irrelevant to the issue of certification. Only the FCC can reduce satellite tier rates, and it will do so on complaint. Complaints may be filed by any franchising authority, even if not certified. Refunds are to be awarded from the date of complaint, which may be filed as early as the effective date of the rules (October 1). Thus, although there is no "reach back" rule by name, the rules applicable to tier complaints operate in the same way from the same date, whether or not a City certifies.

As to the "risk" of informal agreements: The Commission has specifically refused to take regulation over basic service in Cities that have chosen not to certify -- precisely to permit such informal agreements. A non-certified City could

COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN

Richard Weigand July 8, 1993 Page -3-

latitude to settle rate cases." Report & Order in MM Docket 92-266, FCC 93-177 at ¶126 n.337. That is why the FCC lays out a formal process, and provides that subscribers have the right to appeal a City's formal rate decision, even if both the City and the cable operator have "settled" on it.

This has been my point throughout this process. The FCC rate procedures actually reduce the flexibility of cities in regulating rates and reaching informal agreements with local cable operators. Neither I nor you have been trying to weave a dramatic rate increase through a regulatory window left open by non-certification. Had we tried to do so, the Commission's rules will permit cities to undo that subterfuge. What we have tried to do is prevent cities from unthinkingly going down the one-way street of certification only to discover that doing so has cost them and us the flexibility needed to informally resolve rate disputes. Informal agreements should be suitable for so long as informal agreements are satisfactory to the City. Ultimately, the City has to make the choice. But I do not see any risk to the City, and all I see are downsides if a City buys into the FCC rate procedures without realizing that it is forever giving up the flexibility with which it customarily resolves local concerns.

Sincerely,

Paul Glist

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 21st day of July, 1993, copies of the foregoing Opposition to Petitions for Reconsideration were sent by postage-paid, first-class U.S. mail to the following:

Richard E. Wiley
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Attorneys for Corning Incorporated
Scientific-Atlanta, Inc.

Sharon L. Webber
Citizens Communications Center
Institute for Public Representation
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Counsel for CME et al.

Michael E. Glover 1710 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 Attorney for the Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies

J. Roger Wollenberg Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering 2445 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037-12420 Attorneys for ValueVision International, Inc.

Norman M. Sinel Arnold & Porter 1200 New Hampshire Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 Counsel for the Local Governments

James E. Meyers
Baraff, Koerner, Olender &
Hochberg, P.C.
5335 Wisconsin Ave., #300
Washington, D.C. 20015
Attorneys for Encore Media Corp.

Mark J. Palchick
Baraff, Koerner, Olender &
Hochberg, P.C.
5335 Wisconsin Ave., #300
Washington, D.C. 20015
Attorneys for TKR Cable Company
and TKR Cable of Kentucky

Mark J. Palchick
Baraff, Koerner, Olender &
Hochberg, P.C.
5335 Wisconsin Ave., #300
Washington, D.C. 20015
Attorneys for Fairmont Cable TV

Ron D. Katznelson President Multichannel Communication Sciences, Inc. 5910 Pacific Center Blvd. San Diego, CA 92121

Donna C. Gregg Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 Attorneys for E! Entertainment Television, Inc.

Paul J. Berman
Covington & Burling
1201 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
P.O. Box 7566
Washington, D.C. 20044
Attorneys for Longview Cable
Television Co., Inc. and
Kilgore Cable Television Co.

Donna C. Gregg Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 Attorneys for Blade Communications, Inc.

Richard E. Wiley
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Attorneys for Discovery
Communications, Inc.

Diane S. Killory Morrison & Foerster 2000 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Suite 5500 Washington, D.C. 20006 Attorneys for The Disney Channel

Matthew L. Leibowitz Leibowitz & Spencer James A. Penney Vice President and General Counsel Northland Communications Corp. 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3600 Seattle, Washington 98101

Jerry Parker Director of Marketing Superstar Connection 3801 S. Sheridan Road Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145

David B. Gluck 600 Las Colinas Boulevard Suite 2200 Irving, Texas 75039 Attorneys for Affiliated Regional Communications, Ltd.

Stephen R. Ross Ross & Hardies <u>888 Sixteenth Street. N.W.</u> Peter Tannenwald Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036-5339 Counsel for Inland Bay Cable Associates

Daniel L. Brenner 1724 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 Attorney for National Cable Television Association, Inc.

Frank W. Lloyd Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky & Popeo, P.C. 701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004 Thomas L. Robak
President
Apollo CableVision
Incorporated
13100 Alondra Blvd.
Suite 104
Cerritos, California 90701

Maurita K. Coley Vice President, Legal Affairs Black Entertainment Television, Inc. 1232 31st Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007

Larry Whitney President Western Cabled Systems Henry A. Solomon
Haley, Bader & Potts
4350 North Fairfax Drive
Suite 900
Arlington, Virginia 22203-1633
Attorneys for Community
Broadcasters Assn.

Robert Weisberg President Mountain Cablevision, Inc. 145 E. 92 Street New York, New York 10128

William Leventer President Video Data Systems 653 Old Willets Path Hauppauge, New York 11788

Robert G. Scott, J